



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/844,354

04/27/2001

Tomoko Terakado

450100-4138.1

3992

20999 7590 07/21/2008
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER

BROWN, RUEBEN M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/21/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/844,354	Applicant(s) TERAKADO ET AL.	
	Examiner REUBEN M. BROWN	Art Unit 2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are not persuasive. Applicant asserts on page 16 of the Remarks that the claimed subject matter has support in Japanese Patent Priority No. 08-270916 filed October 14, 1996, which would render the Ogdon reference as unavailable prior art. However, applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15. Therefore, the claimed subject matter is still rejected, with the same grounds of rejection, mailed 1/28/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawler, (5,585,838), view of Roop, (U.S. Pat # 5,790,198) and Ogdon, (U.S. Pat # 6,598,075).

Considering claims 1, 11-12, the claimed information providing apparatus and method, comprising;

'hierarchizing section for hierarchizing EPG information to be provided into first information which designates predetermined information on specific broadcast programs, and second information, referred to by the first information as general information on the program', is met by the disclosure of Lawler, (Fig. 4A-4C; col. 11, lines 10-65). Lawler teaches that the EPG display provides a plurality of channel slots/objects that contain the titles of broadcast programs. Both the channel slots and the focus frame 102 that highlights a selected channel slot reads on the claimed first information. The second information reads on the title of the programs in Lawler. The *'hierarchizing means'* reads on the headend 12 in Lawler, which generates EPG data, see Fig. 1; col. 6; col. 12, lines 60-67 thru col. 13, lines 1-10.

Lawler does not specifically discuss whether one of the EPG information may or may be changed. However, the additional feature of, *'wherein the first information, which can be changed, comprises EPG information associated with a program'*, reads on the broadcast start time of a particular broadcast program, see Roop, col. 75, lines 30-67 thru col. 76, lines 1-25; col. 77, lines 15-35; col. 81, lines 10-48 & Table LXI. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Lawler with the feature of

updating changed broadcast time of programs, providing the subscriber with update schedule information as taught by Roop.

'and the second information, which cannot be changed, comprises EPG information associated with a program', is broad enough to read on any of the parameters of the Show list record that are not changed, and any parameters of the EPG in Lawler that are not changed.

'first providing section for providing at least one of the first information and second information', is inherent in Roop which discloses the EPG information packets, that carry EPG data from a broadcaster to a subscriber terminal, see Table LXI.

'second providing section for providing layout information which relates to a layout of the EPG information when displayed on the screen, wherein the first information and the second information each include a tag to enable the data included therein to be associated with the layout information', is inherent in both Lawler & Roop, since the elements of the EPG records are synchronized for display as a unit.

The claimed *'layout information'* reads on the combination of Lawler (col. 7, lines 51-65 & col. 8, lines 21-45) and Roop.

As for the additionally claimed feature of, *'wherein the EPG is displayed according to a delivery medium',* Lawler & Roop do not discuss displaying the images based on the delivery

Art Unit: 2623

method. Nevertheless, Ogdon provides a teaching of displaying images based on the transmission parameters of the delivery network. In particular, Ogdon teaches that the server transmits images over different transmission medium, with different transmission characteristics, such as its data transmission rate, which is at least partially based on the network bandwidth, Abstract; col. 3, lines 35-65; col. 20, lines 10-24; col. 23, lines 4-67 thru col. 24, lines 1-29. Such that images with high resolution are transmitted over a high bandwidth medium, whereas images with lower resolution are transmitted over a low bandwidth medium. Therefore the same image may be simultaneously displayed at a plurality of client devices, differently, according to the delivery method. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in art, to operate Lawler & Roop in a manner wherein images are displayed based on the transmission medium, which allows each client/subscriber to receive/view the transmitted images based on their own network's performance instead of a one-size-fits-all model, as discussed by Ogdon (col. 1, col. 2 & col. 3).

Considering claims 2, 6 & 20, Lawler teaches that EPG may be transmitted to the station controller 18, at least by satellite or CATV which meets the requirement, see col. 7, lines 1-15.

Considering claim 3, Roop teaches that the EPG may be updated, col. 77, lines 20-35.

Considering claims 4-5, Roop teaches the use of the VBI to transmit the EPG data, col. 56, lines 5-15; col. 60, lines 40-64.

Considering claims 7-8, Roop teaches detecting when information within the EPG needs to be updated and only updating that information, which reads on the claimed subject matter, col. 75, lines 30-55; col. 76, lines 10-22.

Considering claims 9-10, the claimed third & fourth information reads on the additional information associated with the programs in Roop, see Table LXI. As for the information identifying a performer, Roop teaches that one of the parameters associated with a TV program may be the actor(s) such as Star 1- Star 3, col. 78, lines 35-45.

Considering claims 13, 15-16 & 21-25, the claimed elements that correspond with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claims 1 & 11, are likewise treated. The additionally claimed features of a first and second acquiring section for acquiring information regarding the first and second information and the layout information is met by the operation of the interactive station controller 18, Lawler col. 7, lines 20-25 & col. 8, lines 21-30, which controls storing and retrieving the EPG information from storage. The claimed '*producing section for producing display information*', reads on the operation of the graphics subsystem 62, which includes video processor subsystem 63 and mixer 64, see col. 7, lines 50-60, in Lawler, in combination with Ogdon.

Considering claim 14, Lawler provides a display means (Fig. 2).

Considering claims 17-18, the feature of first information means designated as second intermediate information reads on combination of Lawler, such as the program grid 80 and program tile 88, col. 8, lines 45-60 & Fig. 3 and Roop.

Considering claim 19, Lawler teaches that the layout information may be received over a wired or satellite connection, and at least temporarily stored in memory in the station controller 18, col. 5, lines 45-60 & col. 7, lines 44-65.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2623

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(571) 273-7290 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to REUBEN M. BROWN M. Brown whose telephone number is (571) 272-7290. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(8:30-6:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Annan Q Shang/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2623